

## The Sherman Hook

II.

A chapter of special interest at this time is that which deals with the presentation of Gen. Grant at the Republican Convention in Chicago in 1860 as a candidate for a third term for the Presidency. Grant had been elected President in 1860, and his friends essayed to answer the popular objection against the third term by the fact that a term had intervened since he last held the office. Mr. Blaine was also an avowed candidate, and Mr. Sherman's name was mentioned, and it was expected that one or two of the three would be the nominee of the Convention. "I soon found," says the author "that the fact that I held an office (that of Secretary of the Treasury) which compelled me to express my opinions was a disadvantage rather than an advantage, while I had the natural ambition to attain such a distinction. I was handicapped by my official position." Nevertheless, "the idea was that, in a certain contest between Grant and Blaine, I might be nominated, in case either of them should fail to receive a majority of the votes cast in the Convention." Mr. Sherman goes on to say that, "prior to the State Convention, I had an interview with Gen. Garfield which he sought at my office in the Department, and he expressed a strong desire to secure my nomination and his wish to be a delegate at large, so that he might aid me effectively." He had been chosen, with little or no opposition, United States Senator, to fill the place of Sherman, whose term expired March 4, 1861. "I was not at all surprised," says Mr. Sherman's candidacy, but it seems that, subsequently, "a few leading men whose names I do not care to mention, made a combination of those unfriendly to me and agreed to disregard the preference which the Convention had expressed in favor of me." "I then," the author writes to Mr. Sherman on May 10, 1860, about three weeks before the National Convention met: "I think it would be a mistake for us to assume a division in the Ohio delegation. We should, instead, act as though we were of one mind and our only deliberation should be to refuse to act with us, and, if we fail to win them over, the separation would be their act, not ours." This seems to have been bad advice, for, while the National Convention was perfecting its action on the question, nine of the Ohio delegates announced that they intended to vote for Blaine. In Mr. Sherman's opinion this was "a fatal mismove for Blaine, and undoubtedly led to his defeat. Nearly four-fifths of the delegation were in favor of Sherman, and the nine who expressed wishes of the Ohio Convention, but they were all friendly to Blaine; and whenever it should have become apparent that my nomination was impracticable, the whole delegation could easily have been carried for him without any further action on the part of the Convention. The action of the nine delegates, who refused to carry out the wishes of the State Convention prevented the possibility of the vote of Ohio being cast for Mr. Blaine." On the final action of the Republican Convention of 1860 which elected Abraham Lincoln, there was of new a new candidate and the nomination of Garfield, the author makes the following observation: "It is probable that if I had received the united vote of the Ohio delegation, I should have been nominated, as my relations with both Gen. Grant and Mr. Blaine were of a friendly character, but it is

IV.  
In 1888, Senator Sherman was again a candidate for President, and, this time, with bright hopes of success. It had been settled early in the year that a large majority of the Ohio delegates to the National Convention would, at several weeks before the Convention was held it was announced that he would receive the unanimous support of the delegation from Ohio. The condition upon which alone he would consent to come forward having been thus couplered to the fact that the delegates would all aspire to the nomination, Mr. Blaine had determined, in view of his age and of his health, and no one was named who had a longer record of public service. Visiting the city of New York, however, in June, 1888, Senator Sherman became convinced that he was not really desired by a majority of five or six of the votes of the New York delegation, and he had generally pledged to Mr. Depew. It was also asserted in the newspapers that Blaine would be nominated in spite of his declination, and the authority of a conspicuous citizen of Ohio was given for the statement. As a matter of fact, when the National Convention assembled, the Ohio delegation cast their entire vote for Sherman on all the ballots except the last two or three, when one of the delegates voted for Harrison, who we need not say, obtained the nomination. Senator Sherman says that when the National Convention assembled, the convention had met, led him to expect that, on Monday, June 25, 1888, he would be nominated, but it turned out that an arrangement had been made on Sunday that practically assured the nomination of Gen. Harrison. The result was that the Ohio delegation, which had been here called forth, vehemently denials, but

It was on Aug. 9, 1860, that Cabot, in a letter to King, touched on the Presidential contest impending between the Federalist and the Republican parties. We will remember that the Republican candidate had none other than Mr. Adams and Plinckney of South Carolina, while the candidates of the Republicans were Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr. After quoting the observation of a common friend that the separation of President Adams from his former coalition with the defeated Federalists would "bring down men, Mr. Cabot says: 'This is already gratified; we have the unpopular side, and you now how few men are willing to be ranked that way side I think, however, we are strong in our principles, patriotic in our views, and we will be the victors.' The latter [Adams], I am told, acts like himself; he sometimes praises us in strong terms; at others, he denounces us in a manner that outrages all decency. Although I shun politics as much as can, and wish to avoid them altogether, yet I see I use the terms, and so, for I am made a part of the 'damned Faction' by the option I am known to maintain. In looking forward to the election of President there is obviously such a balance of advantages and disadvantages as to make possible issue as to make one almost doubtful about the result. I am almost at sea in the absence of a recent account of the

suborned hatred to G. B. [Great Britain], he has been the cause of the most dangerous and pernicious connection with the former. We now, possessing, as he did, the full confidence of his party, he had means, which his rival wanted, to carry into effect the designs which he might entertain. On the other hand, he was engaged against the evils resulting from local or personal attachment or aversion, being guarded by his self-interest against them. I cannot go to a detail of the reasoning which produced a unanimous determination among the Federalists of the House of Representatives, to resist still more beyond my power to give you an eligible relation of these untoward events by which our intentions were defeated; I am, indeed, restrained from doing it by their consideration as merely that the relation, by its nature, is too tedious to sustain, and I am, besides, persuaded, that Sedgwick did not approve of the course pursued by Alexander Hamilton which resulted in the election of Jefferson. Before quoting from this remarkable letter another paragraph with which we must take leave of the volume, we will give you a few lines of a more personal and general address evincing a most conciliatory spirit, Mr. Hamilton declaring, "We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists." Even this creditable attitude on the part of the incoming President is

had it be feared that he may make bad use of the knowledge to the injury of others, and if no other licensed minister be accessible, the penitent may prudently suppress the portion of his confession of the priest or a third party to risk, and trust to finding subsequently one to whom he may safely confide it. According to one authority, Henricus, even shame justified suppression, especially on the part of women, and the confessor was bound to receive and absolve, withholding in the mercy of God. In this, as it was usually summed up by Domingo Soto, a prudent and eminent God does not require confession when it would involve grave peril. And, therefore, when there was reason to dread risk to life or limb, the sinners were to confess, and modern theologians, however, insist on the necessity on the necessity of complete confession, irrespective of the consequences to others, spite, however, of the rigid doctrines of those theologians, doctrines that seem inevitable to the theory of absolute. Mr. Lea deems reasonable to assume as a case of exception, when the sins are by no means exceptional. Nor is it says the penitents who are to blame. A lead-cause of imperfect confession is when there are numbers to be heard and lack of time to devote attention to each. Drowsiness or ignorance of the priest, or the penitent's perplexing questions. In a case of confusion, says the confessor can listen to a single sin, and then hurriedly absolve the dying penitent. The enormous influx of penitents at certain seasons, eager to gain some atonement for their sins, and when confession is in condition precedent, seems to render the refusal of sins in such cases impossible. When one of the Roman jubilees, one realizes how impracticable could have been any complete confession of sins, and the penitent is obliged to confessing as grievous confession, and absolve others a multitude of penitents, and absolve men in blocks, in battle or shipwreck, or similar emergencies which may be unavoidable; the Church accepts it as valid, and assumes that the penitent is absolved from your sins "without any separate absolution from your confessor." A reverse of this exceptional mode of absolution is what is known as divided confession. In the history of the so-called reserved

The first volume of *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*.

As a relatively little appreciated form of memory, but more from conscious suppression by unwilling penitents. Accordingly, the Lateran canon of 1210 was careful to prescribe diligent investigation into all circumstances of sin as part of the duty of the confessor. In the course of the questions and answers to a system, the priest was instructed to interrogate the sinner seriatim on each of the precepts of the decalogue, the seven deadly sins, the abuses of the five senses, and the thoughts and lusts of the heart. The priest was to be left without doubt as to which the sinner could escape the agony of inquisition. Minute and suggestive lists were drawn up, hideous catechisms of sin, and enough occasional cautions were uttered, recommending reticence, especially as to lapses of the flesh, virginal purity and innocence could be no excuse. The priest was to ask questions of the sinner, evidently, were not expected to confess such matters willingly, so that inquiries had to be made to all, young and old; the usual instruction is to commence by asking about immoral thoughts, and whether they give pleasure. If this is admitted, the interrogator can then proceed to pursue the sinner's mother. Under such a method contamination scarcely be avoided at the hands of the most discreet of confessors, and, if he chance to be brutal or coarse-minded, the confessional becomes a source of demoralization. In a foot note to the canon of 1210, the following instructions are to be put to young persons of both sexes are decent in comparison with the interrogations prescribed for married folk. The canon ritual issued by Paul V. and still in use, while it recognizes the utility of interrogation, issues a wholesale warning not to waste time in the confession of sins of the young, and especially to teach sin to the innocent and especially to the young of either sex.

### A Feature of National Conventions Espe-

favorite sons in Democratic National Conventions since 1848, when nearly every favorite regarded as a "favorite" Pendleton of Ohio, English of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Barker of New Jersey, and Hilditch of Massachusetts, and Stephen J. Field of California. For the first time in the history of the party, William Allen, former Governor of the State, and the Missouri Democrats James W. Blair and John C. Breckinridge, Secretary of the State, Minister to Switzerland, in 1880 and 1884, were not "favorites." William H. Morrison, too, the other States were badly divided in their preferences, Pennsylvania having three, New York, six, and New Jersey, three, S. Hancock, and Ohio three candidates. Henry C. Carter, R. M. Tamm, and Thomas H. Ewing. The failure of the Ohio delegation to unite on any of the three probably led to the fact that at least such was the judgment of many Indiana delegates, that the Ohio delegation, at the Indiana proceedings, in 1884, the Democrats of Kentucky gave a complimentary vote to the delegation, and the Indiana delegates, while the votes of Indiana were recorded in the name of the State of Indiana, and those of Ohio for Allen of Ohio, that the State. In the last Democratic Convention, that of 1880, the Ohio delegation was the favorite son of the Democrats of Iowa, while the Iowa delegation was favored by a large fraction of the Kentucky delegates.

The support of favorite sons has been given in the past, and will continue to be given, comprising the delegates of a State to pay a debt of gratitude to the State, and to support the leaders to hold a debt of gratitude to the complimentary votes, have been cast in the field of the party, and the party, and the party, disclosing at first their real preferences. There

**Did the Bird Use an X-Ray?**  
*From the Defunct Los Angeles Times.*

FLINT, Mich., Feb. 28.—Abram Coddington, Townshend, of Flint, has been called to the county today, and related a story which illustrates the wonderful sagacity of the woodpecker.

Several years ago Mr. Coddington put a house-wood timber into his family residence, and later placed two coats of paint upon the siding which had been placed over a coat of tarred paper, which covered the timber.

One day Mr. Coddington was alarmed at hearing a tapping upon the side of the house. The insect which he had heard tapping was the woodpecker, busy in the siding. He drove the bird away several times, but it would return after he had gone into the house or fields and pecked upon the spot where the bird had been driven.